

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, with an option for attendance through Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

**1. Roll Call.**

***Council Members***

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman  
Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman  
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll  
Mr. Whit Osgood  
Dr. Stewart Beckett III  
Ms. Mary LaChance  
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Ms. Lillian Tanski

**a. Pledge of Allegiance** *Led by Mr. Gullotta*

**2. Public Comment.**

***Donna Hendrickson of 1751 Main Street, President of the Historical Society,*** appealed to the Council to declare the former Gaines Hotel, the former Gaines House, and the Victorian building located next to Daybreak Coffee as historical landmarks. She also asked to support the funding of a study that can be done to prevent their demolition.

***Marshall S. Berdan of 2015 Main Street,*** also appealed to the Council to halt the demolition of the buildings. He passed out postcards of the former Curtis House, located at 2389 Main Street. He noted that the year of construction is listed as 1900 in the Town records, which is a fabrication but not far off from the truth. He showed photos of the site from 1886, when the building was not there, and 1904, when the building was there, thus concluding that the house was built sometime between that time period. He then reviewed the history of the site and its former occupants.

***Robert Laughlin, Executive Director of the Historical Society,*** also asked that the buildings which are located at 2278, 2283, and 2285 Main Street be preserved.

***Susan Motycka of 24 Fairfield Lane***, explained that she wrote the article which the Historical Society referenced tonight. She had a wonderful time walking around the former Gaines House, which she called a historic structure. Preserving it will help retain the historic look of town, which is a key reason why people want to live in Glastonbury.

***Steve Bielitz of 80 Newell Lane***, also distributed various postcard photos of the Curtis House and Gaines Hotel. A photo from the 1930s shows that the chimney of the Gaines Hotel had changed. He will conduct a dendrochronology to see if the house is older than listed. He also noted that there is a tunnel underneath the Wright House which connects to another 18th century house. There is the possibility that it was a part of the Underground Railroad. He is trying to engage the state archaeologist to investigate it. He asked that the Council halt the demolitions of the five old buildings in this area.

***Rob Hale of 832 Hopewell Road***, spoke on three different matters:

1. He loves the openness of Glastonbury, not just the open space but the openness of the people. During this election cycle, he has noticed rancorous letters in the Citizen. He appreciates the ability of people to respect each other in this town.
2. He also appreciates the hybrid nature of the Council meetings. He asked that Zoom participants be able to participate with their pictures on the screen. He lamented the lack of uniformity in town policies. While the Council and the TPZ have held in-person meetings, the Board of Education has not. He asked that the Council, as the ultimate authority in town, ask the BOE to do the same.
3. He also retracted a statement he had made at a previous meeting, that the old Kamin's building does not have much architectural merit.

Mr. Gullotta responded to Mr. Hale's comment regarding the BOE meetings. Other than establishing the BOE budget, the BOE is a totally independent town body. The Council is not their final authority.

***Jennifer Wang of 84 April Drive***, spoke on the Town Center development, which she called the heart of Glastonbury. It is critically important to designate historically valuable buildings as historic. She also stated that she knows two residents who live above the shops of the Curtis Hotel building. They value it as a relatively affordable place to live in a convenient location of town. She looks forward to seeing how future development can reflect the community's needs and visions, especially as it pertains to expanding affordable housing options. She also supports the creation of a village district and would love to see robust community input during the process of developing the guidelines.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments received, as listed on the Town website:

**Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road**, stated that the character of Glastonbury has been destroyed. Creation of a Village District should encompass the entire town and town regulations should be rewritten to halt the destructive increasing development. Landowners who are unable to develop their land should be granted a tax abatement.

**CJ Mozzochi of 227 Hebron Avenue**, is opposed to using the ARPA money to supply water to the homes in the Uranium Belt. If the Council approves such an expenditure, he will file a class action lawsuit against the Town and pursue the suit to the Connecticut Supreme Court, if necessary. He also demanded that the Council order the Town Manager, who lives within the Uranium Belt, to recuse himself from discussions pertaining to this matter.

**Ken Merrifield of 5 Willow Brook Drive**, supports additional EV charging stations as a possible use for the ARPA funds. However, he expressed concern with the way that the paragraph is written, which implies that EV charging stations would be "for Town operations." As EVs become more widespread, he is fearful that the few public charging stations in town will be less and less available. He is hopeful that any new EV charging stations would be made available for the public and not limited to just town operations.

**Amanda Constant of 191 Three Mile Road**, supports Jessica Kerger's request to put a crosswalk from Three Mile Road across New London Turnpike, to create a safer route for children walking to Hopewell School.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees:

**Jenna Campana of 202 Lancaster Road**, supports use of the CARES Act funds for converting the open space at Naubuc School into separate classrooms. An open space learning environment puts students at a disadvantage before the teaching has even started. As both a parent and a speech and language pathologist at the school, she is relieved that the space will be converted to something that is more conducive for students.

**Diliana Bakalova-Cross of 15 Checkerberry Lane**, is also a Naubuc School parent who supports the renovation. Her main concern with the current setup is COVID-related. It is a safety risk that about 150 students and teachers are in one large room with no walls and just cubicle-style partitions between the classrooms. It is prudent to address this issue as soon as possible to provide all children at Naubuc a safe environment where they can study.

**Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive**, supports three projects from the CARES Act money: land acquisition for affordable housing; the upgrade and improvement to the Welles Park playground; and the renovation of the open classroom space at Naubuc School.

*Michael Litke of 292 Feldspar Ridge*, also supports the proposed allocation of the CARES funding for the open space renovation at Naubuc School. As the Principal of the Naubuc School, he appreciates the current design, which not only adds four classrooms, but also saves the Town money through the installation of mechanicals and other features.

3.      **Special Reports.**            *None*
  
4.      **Old Business.**             *None*
  
5.      **New Business.**
  - a.     **Action on Resolution in support of preserving the historic buildings at 2277-2289 and 2389 Main Street.**

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

**WHEREAS**, *the Town of Glastonbury was originally incorporated in 1693 and over the past 328 years has developed a rich cultural heritage of people, places and buildings; and*

**WHEREAS**, *a continuing goal of the community is the successful blend of old and new recognizing the critical importance of preserving the diverse history of Glastonbury for current and future generations; and*

**WHEREAS**, *for decades Glastonbury has been recognized as having the second greatest number of pre-revolutionary era homes among towns across the country; and*

**WHEREAS**, *the Main Street Historic District was established in 1984 to protect and preserve the many historic buildings located along Main Street and the Historic District Commission created to guide preservation activities within the District; and*

**WHEREAS**, *a project involving new commercial and residential development is proposed for the Town Center Area immediately adjoining the Main Street Historic District to include proposed removal of two historic buildings, including the Wright-Gaines House (1740), the former Gaines House Hotel (1864) and the building at 2389 Main Street originally constructed in the early 1900s, which structures are important to the history and streetscape of Main Street; and*

**WHEREAS**, *when the project was initially presented in early 2021, the proposed removal of these buildings brought widespread concern by the members of the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Historical Society, Town Council, and Glastonbury community; and*

**WHEREAS**, *the applicant for the Main Street project was asked to protect these buildings to preserve the Main Street streetscape and recognize the significant importance of these buildings to the heritage and history of Glastonbury.*

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, *that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby expresses its strong opposition to any action to remove or demolish these historic properties and asks the proponent of the Main Street project to preserve and meaningfully include these older structures as part of any revised*

*proposal for residential and commercial development at this location to protect the important cultural heritage of the Glastonbury community.*

***In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and caused this seal to be affixed.***

*Thomas P. Gullotta  
Lawrence Niland  
Deborah A. Carroll  
Whit Osgood  
Stewart Beckett III*

*Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mary LaChance  
Jacob McChesney  
Lillian Tanski*

***Date: October 12, 2021***

***Disc:*** Mr. Cavanaugh thanked the public for coming out to speak on this resolution, which he will support. He then inquired about a communication which stated that a negotiation may be possible between the applicant's attorney and the Town. Mr. Johnson explained that, when the proposal was first presented as a resolution, the applicant, through its counsel, was asked to look at ways to preserve these structures as part of any proposal. A possible concept could be that the regulations require that commercial development be replaced on a one-to-one basis. That is as far as the discussions have gone regarding options. Mr. Gullotta noted that they have received an interesting new piece of information tonight. If the underground railroad hypothesis proves to be true, then this becomes a question of preserving US history. He made a plea to the developer's attorney, Mr. Alter, that his applicant finds a way to preserve these buildings.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that any negotiations should begin with the withdrawal of the demolition application. Mr. Osgood remarked that the application is to the TPZ, not to the Council. They cannot negotiate with one applicant without the proper process for zoning review. Mr. Cavanaugh responded that this is not a zoning issue. Their job is to save those two buildings. Ms. Tanski agreed with Mr. Osgood regarding the legal situation, noting that the Council is not in the position to specifically negotiate zoning regulations with potential developers. She trusts the Town Manager and Town Staff that those negotiations will be conducted in an appropriate manner. She noted that proactive measures must be taken to delineate which buildings in town need to be preserved, to prevent the current situation of halting otherwise positive economic development to save one building on an ad hoc basis. She is hopeful that future discussions on developing comprehensive design guidelines will touch on this.

Mr. Niland stated that last week's TPZ meeting drew a very impassioned crowd, who support the preservation of these buildings. He is hopeful that the developer and his attorney have heard this. Mr. McChesney also supports the resolution, calling it an important step. He also thanked the public for sharing the long history of these buildings, which add to why they should be preserved. Ms. LaChance thanked the Historical Society for providing invaluable historical

information regarding the buildings. She supports the resolution and hopes that the developer will work with the town.

Dr. Beckett also thanked the Historical Society for their insights. The developers need to recognize that those buildings have been part of Glastonbury's culture for many years. He is sure that they can all sit down and come to a reasonable conclusion. Ms. Carroll reiterated a quote shared by Mr. Laughlin at a previous meeting, that architecture should be an affirmation of place. This is an opportunity for the Town to affirm their sense of place by preserving these buildings. She hopes that the developer and their representatives are paying close attention.

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**b. Action to schedule public hearing – sidewalks (Spring Street, Bantle Road, House Street and Main Street/Route 17 between Overlook Road and Buttonball Lane).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 26, 2021 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider proposed new sidewalk construction including:*

- *Spring Street*
- *Bantle Road*
- *House Street (complete sections linking to multi-use trailhead)*
- *Main Street/Route 17 (Overlook Road to Route 17/Main/Buttonball)*

*as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**c. Action on Resolution authorizing the issuance of refunding bonds – General Obligation Bonds.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the*

*RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT EXCEEDING \$9,000,000 REFUNDING BONDS FOR PAYMENT IN WHOLE OR IN PART OF THE OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL OF AND INTEREST AND ANY CALL PREMIUM ON THE TOWN OF*

*GLASTONBURY'S \$3,680,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, ISSUE OF 2011, SERIES B-TAXABLE AND \$8,950,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, ISSUE OF 2013 (FEDERALLY TAXABLE), AND COSTS RELATED THERETO,*

*as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021.*

*RESOLVED,*

*(a) That the Town of Glastonbury issue its refunding bonds, in an amount not to exceed NINE MILLION DOLLARS (\$9,000,000), the proceeds of which are hereby appropriated: (1) to fund one or more escrows, and to apply the balance held in such escrows, together with the investment earnings thereon, to the payment in whole or in part, as to be determined by the Town Manager and the Treasurer, of the outstanding principal of and interest and any call premium on the Town's \$3,680,000 General Obligation Bonds, Issue of 2011, Series B-Taxable (consisting at issue of \$3,680,000 General Purpose Bonds) and the Town's \$8,950,000 General Obligation Bonds, Issue of 2013 (Federally Taxable) (consisting at issue of \$8,950,000 General Purpose Bonds), including the payment of interest accrued on said bonds to the date of payment, and (2) to pay costs of issuance of the refunding bonds authorized hereby, including legal fees, consultants' fees, trustee or escrow agent fees, underwriters' fees, net interest and other financing costs and other costs related to the payment of the outstanding bonds described above. The refunding bonds shall be issued pursuant to Section 7-370c of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended, and any other enabling acts. The bonds shall be general obligations of the Town secured by the irrevocable pledge of the full faith and credit of the Town.*

*(b) That the Town Manager and the Treasurer of the Town shall sign the bonds by their manual or facsimile signatures. The law firm of Pullman & Comley, LLC is designated as bond counsel to approve the legality of the bonds. The Town Manager and the Treasurer are authorized to determine the amount, date, interest rates, maturities, redemption provisions, form and other details of the bonds; to designate one or more banks or trust companies to be certifying bank, registrar, transfer agent and paying agent for the bonds; to provide for the keeping of a record of the bonds or notes; to sell the bonds at public or private sale; to deliver the bonds; and to perform all other acts which are necessary or appropriate to issue the bonds.*

*(c) That the Town hereby declares its official intent under Federal Income Tax Regulation Section 1.150-2 that costs of the refunding may be paid from temporary advances of available funds and that (except to the extent reimbursed from grant moneys) the Town reasonably expects to reimburse any such advances from the proceeds of borrowings in an aggregate principal amount not in excess of the amount of borrowing authorized above for the refunding. The Town Manager and the Treasurer are authorized to amend such declaration of official intent as they deem necessary or advisable and to bind the Town pursuant to such representations and covenants as they deem necessary or advisable in order to maintain the continued exemption from federal income taxation of interest on the bonds authorized by this resolution, if issued on a tax-exempt basis, including covenants to pay rebates of investment earnings to the United States in future years.*

(c) That the Town Manager and the Treasurer are authorized to make representations and enter into written agreements for the benefit of holders of the bonds to provide secondary market disclosure information, which agreements may include such terms as they deem advisable or appropriate in order to comply with applicable laws or rules pertaining to the sale or purchase of such bonds.

(d) That the Town Manager and the Treasurer are authorized to take all other action which is necessary or desirable to enable the Town to effectuate the refunding of all or a portion of the Refunded Bonds, and to issue refunding bonds authorized hereby for such purposes, including, but not limited to, the entrance into agreements on behalf of the Town with underwriters, trustees, escrow agents and others to facilitate the issuance of the refunding bonds, the escrow of the proceeds thereof and investment earnings thereon, and the payment of the outstanding bonds in whole or in part.

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**d. Action on between department transfer – Insurance Line Items to Insurance Reserve Fund – \$47,200.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$47,200 transfer from Insurance/Pensions-Casualty Insurance and Claims Service and Retro Charges to the Insurance Reserve Fund (non-health), as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**6. Consent Calendar.**

**a. Action on road acceptance – Wendell Lane.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council (Zoning Authority) approves the following as a Town road, as recommended by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission at its September 21, 2021 meeting:*

- *Wendell Lane from Station 0+00 to Station 11+40, within the Wendell's Woods Subdivision.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.



**b. Action to renew Lease Agreement with East Glastonbury Public Library.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to renew the Lease between the Town and East Glastonbury Library for a 5-year term January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2023, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**c. Action on waiver of competitive bid process – replacement pump for sanitary sewer system.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a waiver of the competitive bid process for purchase of a new sewage pump for the Hubbard Pump Station, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**7. Town Manager's Report.**

Mr. Gullotta asked for the estimated cost of conducting the historical preservation study. Mr. Johnson explained that his best estimate as of now is \$5,000. However, an inspection has not yet been conducted, so he will know better next week. At Mr. Osgood's request, Mr. Johnson reviewed the process by which an application is put together and potential stumbling blocks they may encounter. The application passes through the State Historical Preservation Officers (SHPO) staff, then the SHPO Board of Directors, which, if approved, will be sent to the National Park Service and the Federal Government to make the final determination. If a property owner objects to the designation, then it stops the process. In this case, it is a sole property owner. If that were to happen, they could proceed with a determination through SHPO and the National Park Service that a property is eligible for designation, but that is not a National Register designation. No council member objected to moving forward with the application.

Mr. McChesney asked if the video feature could be turned on for speakers through Zoom. Mr. Johnson explained that it is possible, but it takes time to bring people on as panelists. Mr. McChesney asked to address the public comment regarding the construction of a crosswalk on Three Mile Road. Mr. Johnson stated that it is a challenge because the area is not safe to cross. Public safety staff do not recommend installing crosswalks on Chestnut Hill and Three Mile Road. Mr. Osgood noted that the application for the apartments on Hebron Avenue and Main Street is including street parking in their parking requirements. He asked to confirm that the

parking requirement is that spaces be located on the lot, not on public land. Mr. Johnson agreed to do so. Mr. Osgood asked the BOE to present on what they used the one percent fund monies for in the past year, and what funds they anticipate receiving. Mr. Johnson agreed to pass on the request again.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that there was a memo on license plate readers. He asked if there is a way to determine if the police department has enough officers on the road by either land mass or population. Mr. Johnson stated that they can provide that information. Mr. Cavanaugh asked that in the coming year, they look at ways to expand signs on properties slated for demolition, and to expand the demolition notice from 90 days to 120 days for buildings that are considered of historic value. He then asked if Mr. Johnson would like to respond to the memo which claimed that he had a conflict of interest regarding the expansion of public water in the Chestnut Hill area. Mr. Johnson explained that a question was brought up on his home being in an area of high uranium. Two years ago, he approached the Ethics Commission for an advisory opinion regarding the matter, and they indicated that he did not have any conflict. Therefore, the matter has been addressed.

## **PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENT ON POTENTIAL USES OF MONIES ALLOCATED TO GLASTONBURY THROUGH THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA).**

Mr. Johnson provided background on ARPA before reviewing a list of potential uses for the money. He noted that the Town will receive a total of \$10.2 million in two lifts: \$5.1 million was received in May 2021 and another \$5.1 million will be received in May 2022. The monies need to be allocated by December 31, 2021 and expended by December 31, 2026. Originally, there was going to be a preliminary report on potential uses by the end of this month, but that deadline was pushed out to the end of April 2022.

He noted that the projects are preliminary broad stroke concepts, so they did not spend a lot of time going through cost estimates. Categories for eligible uses contain subsets within them. He delineated the categories as the following: support public health response, enhance water and sewer infrastructure, address negative economic impacts, expand broadband infrastructure, replace lost revenue from the pandemic, increase equity focused services, and premium pay for essential workers. Ineligible uses include the following: payments towards unfunded pension liabilities, matching funds toward federal grants, interest or principal on outstanding debt, and contributing to financial reserves or rainy-day funds.

Mr. Johnson then reviewed the list of potential projects:

Regarding broadband infrastructure, Mr. Johnson noted that Mr. Ashton from IT and Mr. Griffin from the Housing Authority worked on extending fiber to homes in senior living and congregate/assisted living facilities. Regarding affordable housing, Mr. Johnson noted the possibility of the Town acquiring a site, then working with the Housing Authority to complete an affordable rental housing or other project. Another concept to explore for expanding affordable housing could be through the land acquisition fund.

The possibilities for the Riverfront Community Center include funds to improve/enhance the outdoor space where many programs are held because of the pandemic. There is also a proposal to renovate the American Legion building, which the Council will be purchasing, to include ADA accessibility and enhanced ventilation. Because there is limited space for meetings at Town Hall, improving upon the Williams Memorial building could provide an opportunity to supplement public meeting space. There is also a proposal to upgrade and replace playground equipment at public parks, as well as enhancing accessibility to various playing fields and facilities and the potential of a satellite food bank.

Mr. Johnson explained that the backyard of the Youth and Family Services was a great spot for events during the pandemic, but it is not accessible to those with disabilities. The proposal is to upgrade access to that area. Youth and Family Services also identified the Youth Mentorship program and the Youth Dial a Ride program. There is also the potential to use funds towards the boathouse, which experienced revenue loss during the pandemic. Mr. Johnson then spoke about Naubuc School, which was brought up during the public comment session. The proposal is to renovate 17,000 square feet of the open classroom concept. He noted that because of state school reimbursement, he questioned whether ARPA monies should be allocated to this project, or if it should be paid through the Capital Program in a phased approach.

Other projects to fund could include updates to the sanitary sewer system, the drainage system, and providing grants to nonprofits and small business assistance. He clarified that expanding public water in the Uranium Belt is an eligible use, but the order of magnitude for the cost is far greater than the ARPA money. Another potential project is to install camera systems to traffic signals if there is a direct relation of increase in traffic crime to the pandemic. Funds could also be appropriated to expand green infrastructure, which includes sustainability, energy efficiency, and EV charging stations.

Chairman Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

***Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace***, supports using the land acquisition fund to expand affordable housing opportunities. She is not able to comment on the different proposals tonight,

so she hopes for additional public engagement. She also hopes that the Council will pay close attention to the health and economic impacts of the pandemic, especially on low income and people of color. She noted that the Town's Affordable Housing Steering Committee is meeting now to see how to increase the affordable housing supply in Glastonbury. This will help the Town meet its general obligations, not just ARPA's, and will further efforts to make Glastonbury a welcoming community.

**Jennifer Wang of 84 April Drive**, stated that a lot of themes have emerged from this list, and she believes that the community's shared values will dictate how they decide which items are priorities. She would like to level the playing field for all, and this provides an unprecedented opportunity for municipalities to do that. They should take a deliberative process and open it up to further public meetings. She also asked that the Council explore collaboration with neighboring towns, so that they can acquire mutual gains for lower costs.

**Rob Hale of 832 Hopewell Road**, noted that the expansion of paving throughout town, coupled with more severe storms, have resulted in lots of heavy flooding in recent years. This is a dangerous situation, and with climate change and intense rainfall events, it is going to get worse. He believes that the Town needs a plan to slow down the water going into water courses. He supports using ARPA money to prevent future tragedies.

Ms. Carroll read the written comment received:

**Gail Tomala of 29 Fawn Road**, is opposed to spending ARPA money on installing public water in the Chestnut Hill area, where there are high concentrations of uranium. She warned that it will be a very costly and possibly dead-end project. There should be a complete neighborhood survey beforehand, and all expenses would need to be incurred by each household to access public water. Important, detailed data should be made available to the public and the neighborhood before a vote.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments via Zoom:

**Allen Friedrich at 47 Prospect Street**, is President of Bike Walk Glastonbury. He appreciates the installation of sidewalks, bike trails, and walkways in the last few years which have made the town safer. He is looking forward to working with the town to build further connections. He hopes that some of the funding from this grant will come their way to complete this process.

**Joseph Muro of 151 Riverview Road**, believes that the Town should allocate most of the funds toward uses that impact the most amount of people as possible. That is why he supports projects such as the investment of 1361 Main Street (the American Legion building), public parks, drainage, and sidewalks. He is opposed to the Williams Memorial enhancement, expanding

broadband at Town Hall, and installing EV charging stations because these projects affect a small number of people. Regarding the EV stations, he noted that many options exist for acquiring private funding, which they should pursue instead.

***Rob Hale of 832 Hopewell Road***, stated that curbing plays a large part in routing all the way onto the road and into the sewers. Years ago, most roads did not have them. They have gotten higher, with more water onto the roadway, and less filtering onto people's yards. This is a hazard. They should make them porous or put gaps so that water can filter out.

Mr. Gullotta stated that this is only the beginning of the process, which will take a while. He assured the public that there will be more hearings and opportunities for them to voice their comments, questions, and concerns. Dr. Beckett agreed with Mr. Hale's comment that there have been more drainage problems throughout town. He requested that the Town Manager invite Mr. Pennington to present on the status of drainage. He also would like to consider capital projects that are eligible for ARPA funding, which can reduce operating expenditures. Mr. Osgood agreed, adding that it will save taxpayers money. Ms. Carroll inquired about next steps. Mr. Johnson explained that the deadline to appropriate the money is over three years from now, so there is no urgency.

Mr. Cavanaugh agrees that there will need to be another two or three public hearings on this. He then asked about the BOE's allocation. Mr. Johnson explained that the BOE received a separate allocation of about \$1.4 million. Mr. Cavanaugh believes that some of their capital projects have become so large that they require a referendum. He is not willing to fund the Naubuc School project on a cash basis. The cost runs \$3.2 million, which he believes is a referendum item. He agreed with Dr. Beckett that they should look into pursuing capital improvement projects that would cause a blip in the mill rate.

Mr. Niland thanked Mr. Johnson for putting together the list and agreed that they need to spread the word to the public to get their feedback. He also asked to address the request from CRCOG and the timing on it. Mr. Johnson explained that next Tuesday, he will attend CRCOG's meeting regarding a region-wide project. CRCOG is inquiring whether member towns would contribute 2% of their county allocations to the project. The second request is for technical assistance, which they are fine with. He will return with more information on the regional transformation project.

Ms. Tanski agrees that there needs to be more public comment on this list before making prioritization lists. While she recognizes the necessity of the renovation project at the Naubuc School, she does not support using ARPA monies to fund it. Instead, it could be looked at for bonding. She then addressed her former BOE colleagues, expressing concern at the ways in which the BOE has been prioritizing the use of federal funding. The Naubuc School renovation

project is a matter of equity and necessity, so it should have been prioritized higher than it was. Mr. Gullotta stated that the Naubuc School project needs to happen, but how it happens will be determined during the CIP process.

Regarding broadband infrastructure, Ms. Tanski inquired about support at vaccination clinics. Mr. Johnson explained that he and Health Director Wendy Mis discussed this. She would like to make certain that they have all the technology infrastructure in place for mass vaccinations. Town IT Manager Bobby Ashton explained that they hope to install new hardware and wireless upgrades for mass vaccinations. He has not yet received any dates from Ms. Mis, but the plan is to hook them up in the next few weeks. Mr. McChesney is concerned about the impact that the pandemic has had on businesses in town. While a huge component of development has been residential projects, he hopes to see more support and development for commercial projects throughout town. He is curious about what options they have to aid and expand businesses.

**NO 2: PUBLIC HEARING – ACTION ON \$46,000 TRANSFER FROM THE GENERAL-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE TO REFUSE-CONTRACTUAL SERVICES FOR DISPOSAL COSTS RELATED TO STORM ISAIAS.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$46,000 transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Refuse-Contractual Services for storm disposal costs related to Storm Isaias, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 8, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}. Ms. Tanski stepped out of the room prior to voting.

**8. Committee Reports.**

**a. Chairman’s Report.** *None*

**b. MDC.**

Ms. LaChance stated that the final vote on the budget will be held on December 6, 2021.

**c. CRCOG.**

Dr. Beckett had no report, but Mr. McChesney noted that CRCOG held an informative two-part panel with UConn on juvenile crime. He encouraged all to check out the videos.

**9. Communications.**

- a. Letter from Northeast Site Solutions regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 63 Woodland Street.
- b. Correspondence received from Leslie Lavery regarding Main Street proposal for redevelopment.

**10. Minutes.**

- a. Minutes of September 28, 2021 Regular Meeting.

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*Result:* Minutes were accepted with one abstention {8-1-0} from Mr. Osgood since he was not present at the meeting.

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

- a. Resignation of Arnold Higgins from the Board of Fire Commission (D-2025)

Mr. Gullotta observed that Sergeant Higgins has served the town well for many years. He thanked him for his service and wished him good health. Mr. Cavanaugh suggested that the Council send a letter to Mr. Higgins showing appreciation for his service to the community. The Council agreed to do so by consensus.

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*Result:* Resignation was unanimously accepted with regret {9-0-0}.

**12. Executive Session.**

- a. Potential land acquisition.
- b. Personnel Matter – Town Manager (Added to the agenda)

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition and Personnel Matter — Town Manager at 9:25 P.M.*

*Result:* Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

*Present for the Executive Session item were council members, Mr. Tom Gullotta, Chairman, Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman, Dr. Beckett, Ms. Deb Carroll, Ms. Mary*

*LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Ms. Lillian Tanski, Mr. Osgood, and Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.*

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 9:44 P.M. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

Following the Executive Session and Meeting Adjournment, the Council, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, entered a non-meeting format discussion to discuss, in private, collective bargaining negotiations, which discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

They came out of the non-meeting format discussion at 10:00 P.M.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan  
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta  
Chairman**